



## ADOT STATEWIDE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN



### YUMA DISTRICT AGENCY STAFF WORKSHOP

May 31, 2006 / 2:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

City of Yuma Public Works Training Room,  
155 W. 14th Street, Yuma

### ATTENDANCE

John Pein, *ADOT, Planning Manager*

Paul Patane, *ADOT, Yuma District*

Cathie Alonzo- *Yuma Proving Grounds*

Emmett Brinkerhoff-*Quartzsite Public Works*

Paul Brooberg-*City of Yuma*

Carol Coleman- *Yuma Proving Grounds*

Hector Coronado-*City of Somerton*

Ken Epperley- *Yuma Proving Grounds*

Lynn Farmer-*Town of Gila Bend*

Stephen Fusilier- *Bureau of Land Management*

Dan Field-*City of Quartzsite*

Bernice Gonzalez-*Yuma Proving Grounds*

Carlos Gonzalez-*City of San Luis*

Miguel Lowell-*City of San Luis*

Mack Luckie-*YMPO*

Paul Melck-*YMPO*

Edmundo Mendez- *City of Somerton*

Roger Patterson-*Yuma County*

Manuel Patron-*City of San Luis*

Steve Plaisance- *Yuma Proving Grounds*

Fernando Precich-*Yuma County*

Jerry Ramirez-*ADOT*

Bill Rezin- *Yuma Proving Grounds*

Mike Shores- *City of Somerton*

Jack Simes-*Bureau of Reclamation*

Marc Skoglund- *City of Quartzsite*

John Spricky-*Yuma County*

Patricia Weeks-*MCAS*

### Consultant Staff in Attendance

Rick Ensdorff, *URS*

Caraly Foreman, *URS*

Jennifer Spencer, *URS*

## HANDOUTS:

Agency Outreach Meeting – Agenda (1 page)  
Conceptual Access Management Decision Flow Chart (1 page)  
Arizona Statewide Access Management Program Overview (pamphlet)  
Benefits Of A Statewide Access Management Program For Arizona (pamphlet)

## MEETING SUMMARY

An Agency Staff Workshop of the Statewide Access Management Program project was held on May 31, 2006 at the City of Yuma Public Works Training Room on 155 W. 14th Street in Yuma, Arizona.

### 1. Introductions

John Pein, ADOT Manager, Regional / Statewide Planning, began introductions and gave some information on what the project means, and the importance of stakeholder participation.

Paul Patane, ADOT Yuma District Engineer, then spoke about the need for Access Management. He mentioned the more driveways, the more accidents and delays for drivers; Access Management could help manage those issues. Access Management would also preserve the integrity of the system in the event of growth.

Rick Ensdorff asked the attendants to go around the room and introduce themselves. He then gave a quick background of his professional experience. He presented a brief summary of why the program is needed, and talked about the importance and benefits of Access Management Program, how we got to where we are, and provided samples of other efforts like State of Colorado and New Mexico, and the objective of access management. Rick stressed that in order for this project to work; it would require input from all agencies and would need to be a partnership between the local agencies and ADOT. He also encouraged participation at any time during the presentation.

### 2. PowerPoint Presentation

A PowerPoint presentation, which will also be available on the website, was presented and discussed the following:

- What is Access Management
- Access Features Typically Managed
- Benefits of Access Management
- NHCRP Report 420-Impacts of Access Management Techniques
- Crashes in Arizona, 2003, Access Related Crashes in Arizona
- Policy Initiative



## ADOT STATEWIDE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN



### YUMA DISTRICT AGENCY STAFF WORKSHOP

- Arizona Access Management Program Work Flow Diagram and Schedule
- Access Decisions:
  - Access Permitting Process
  - Planning
  - Local Agencies
  - ADOT Construction Practices
  - Arizona Highway Projects
  - Right of Way Activities
  - Transportation Board
  - Traffic and Safety Programs
- Vision Statement
- Program Objectives
- Local Agency Perspective on Access Management
- How a Statewide Access Management Program will work.
- Conceptual Access Management Decision Flow Chart
- ADOT/Local Agency Coordination
- Classification System
- Access Classifications: The Heart of the Program
- Hierarchy of Access Classifications
- Access Classification Considerations
- Colorado Classification System
- Key Design Elements
- Waiver/Variance Process
- Other Considerations: Access Management Plans, Interim Permit Approval
- Brief Your Local Officials
- Business and Development Community Participation
- District Agency Outreach

The project's Vision Statement was discussed. Rick Ensdorff explained that we need to have a framework but it needs flexibility and a way to deal with "gray areas". Keep the program consistent and reliable while allowing local flexibility to manage access decisions over time.

Rick Ensdorff explained that Access Management is defined as a systematic management of location, spacing and design of access roads and access points. Access Management includes state highways. The benefits of Access Management were further explained, including Safety, Mobility, and Economic.

Rick discussed that the data shows the more access points there are, the greater potential for accidents. Access Management accidents are defined as occurring at a driveway and state roadway, or, at an intersection and state roadway. Although currently unavailable, Rick hopes to have specific data for Arizona to share with agencies in the near future.



Rick went on to discuss the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) establishment and composition as well as the Work Flow Diagram. He mentioned that the Access Management has many benefits and again stressed that ADOT and local agencies need to start a partnership as that will be the key to make this program a success.

Per Rick, the agency outreach conducted, so far, has revealed that the procedures and policies are not consistent and do not have enough “teeth”. He posed the following questions to the group: “What’s going on in Yuma?”, “What works?” and “What doesn’t?”

The Access Management plan is to have all state highways designated with classifications. This process is planned for June 2007 completion. The Management plan consists of several pieces - as outlined in the Access Decisions slide - it’s not just permits. Access Management will be an everyday tool that will support long-term use and consistency.

The goal in Safety would be to reduce the incident of car crashes in a 50%, increase pedestrian and cyclists safety and to increase roadway capacity 23-45%.

Rick stated that legal review has been done with the Attorney General. The Current study is nearly complete, providing an overview of where we are at now and where we are heading.

Patricia Weeks-MCAS-asked if the Access Management website is open to the public. Rick responded that, “yes” it was and it will be regularly updated as the project progresses. It can be found on the ADOT site under [http://tpd.azdot.gov/planning/am\\_statewideplan.php](http://tpd.azdot.gov/planning/am_statewideplan.php). In addition to the website, Caraly Foreman mentioned the email address from which the invitations were sent, **ADOT\_SAMP\_Project@urscorp.com**, could also be used as a resource to obtain answers and provide comments.

Dan Field commented that he thought Access Management was a good idea and a long time coming. He used the West Valley in Phoenix as an example citing it looks like they didn’t expect that much development and there are some issues that could have possibly been avoided if such a plan was in place. He also mentioned it’s best to invite ADOT in at a local level at the planning and development stage. He used Highway 95 as an example.

Roger Patterson-Yuma County- then mentioned he thinks the pitfall with the current system is that it is too flexible – you can “argue” a driveway. He wanted to know if that will be an issue with this new plan? Rick Ensdorff replied citing that cities would need to understand what is expected. There are circumstances that require flexibility, but those would be unique - not the everyday circumstances. As an example, in Colorado 90% of the time it is clear (due to the classification process and guidelines), but there are those instances 10% of the time where a more flexible option is needed. The clear and defined process at the core will limit those unique circumstances, however, it is known that throughout the project some tweaks will be needed.



Paul Patane said that 12 months out of the year there are traffic problems, and mentioned 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue as an example of what not to do – there are lots of driveways.

A question was asked about the plan becoming part of legislation. Rick replied that legislation is not necessary and cited the case of Colorado in which the Access Management plan did become part of legislation. However, Arizona is further along than Colorado was at this time in the process.

Jerry Ramirez-ADOT-then asked, what would happen to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue after the Access Management plan is implemented? How would we fix guidelines that are limiting us now? Rick said we need to look forward, the plan will not be retroactive and will not change already completed areas; however, “issue” areas may be handled under re-development and/or new development. The Access Management plan will be from this point forward – once implemented.

A Yuma County Representative mentioned it might be in the best interest of business to work with the Access Management plan as they will get more traffic and in turn business if there is better access to their location. The plan would allow for guidelines for design and allow for enough room to park, to safely exit the lot, etc.

John Pein brought up Payson SR 87, heading up North, as an example of flexibility. In this case, Home Depot wanted to move in and add signals. Prescott did not want the signals at that location, and the option of a roundabout was agreed upon. Home Depot paid for it and it seems to be working well.

Rick then asked attendees, “How do you work with ADOT now?”

Dan Field-City of Quartzsite, said he tries to bring ADOT in early, however, politics sometimes get in the way. He did say that in some cases, using ADOT would prevent work that Yuma also agreed may not be a good plan, e.g. truck stops as general commercial but shouldn't be general commercial.

Carol Coleman-YPG, mentioned the need to make changes on 95 should involve early dialogue with ADOT.

Yuma City mentioned they are very coordinated with ADOT, as they hold quarterly meetings.

The discussion then turned to the Turn Back policy. John Pein said Access Management was not connected with the Turn Back policy. ADOT had placed a permanent hold on the policy and issues were being addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Rick Ensdruff then discussed the Decision Flow Chart slide. He indicated that the development of the Access Management has not been developed and that it will be by working with those in the room and additional resources. He also mentioned that Access Management plans were in place in the following



states, Colorado, New Jersey, Florida and some in New Mexico and that Arizona can benefit from their experience.

Rick posed to the group, “Who is currently involved in the decision making process?” and at “What time in the process?”

As for who is involved, the following comments were made:

Yuma City mentioned they have predevelopment meetings that may, at times, involve traffic engineers. They also mentioned they use ADOT Impact Guidelines.

Quartzsite said they have the following involved in their process: ADOT, Public Works, PNC, engineering, the developer’s engineer’s and/or legal counsel, and at times the Fire Department.

Yuma County’s process involves the Parks Department, and possibly the developing engineer. They also mentioned they use their own impact study guidelines and have quarterly meetings with ADOT.

As for the process, the following comment was mentioned:

Dan Field-City of Quartzsite, said there is a draw up of the developer’s conditions and are then are sent off to the agencies for responses. Then, when the developer is present, they go around the room and get feedback.

Rick wanted to know if a developer could get approval without an ADOT permit in hand. Several counties mentioned it does happen on occasion. At that time, Rick highlighted that a benefit of the Access Management plan would be to provide the commonalities of who is involved in the decision making process and at what point. Rick took this opportunity to say the permit goes with the person, not with the property. If the property gets a new owner, that owner has 30 days to reapply.

With regard to permits, Dan Field said they need to get the elected official’s buy-in, the officials don’t want to give up control to the state. However, it needs to be conveyed and understood that permits and plans are in place to promote public safety and welfare – what everyone is after. Jerry Ramirez further added that people may not be out to “cheat” the system, they just may not be well informed about the permit process.

Rick Ensdorff then returned to the presentation and discussed the “Classifications” slide in the presentations and, when asked, provided background on developers’ responses to a new system. He also included additional Fort Collins experience examples, such as where the developers actually did homework before applying for a permit based on the classification system, which prevented “the wheel from being reinvented each time.”





Rick Ensdorff also added that a classification system: 1) determines your expected performance, and 2) provides day-to-day permitting actions that support the state and local transportation plans. Determining the classification process will be interactive between agencies and ADOT.

Rick Ensdorff showed the partial Excel spreadsheet for the state of Colorado's classification. At that time, John Spricky asked how long it took Colorado to obtain the classifications for all their roads. Rick Ensdorff replied they were in place the first couple of years. Rick again outlined the projects deadlines, the final report, including the classifications, would be complete in June 2007.

Rick Ensdorff then outlined some possible Arizona classifications. The plan is to have these mostly complete by the end of this summer. For the next workshop, there will be some real road examples and classifications. Rick Ensdorff also hopes to have examples for each specific to the Yuma area. So as not to surprise those at the meeting with this information for the first time, the plan is to update the website and send out correspondence. If you have attended this meeting, you will be contacted with future updates regarding this project.

Some attendees asked why not use the already existing federal categories. Rick Ensdorff replied, and it was echoed by John Pein, that the federal categories are primary used for funding and by also using them for Access Management may create some confusion. For federal, there are some 16 categories; the Access Management plan would be more general. Rick Ensdorff also took this time to mention that a change in a classification is not a simple process - it would need to be approved by the transportation board. Both parties need to agree on the change.

Rick Ensdorff mentioned, with the Access Management plan in place, that design guidelines will occur early in the process. Currently, most Access Management plans for Arizona are done during construction.

Rick Ensdorff went on to discuss the next steps and action items needed for the project to move forward. He indicated that we needed to leave them with important homework to go back to their organizations and to brief the local agencies and officials, especially the elected officials and senior management, about this Access Management Program. A letter, from ADOT, is being drafted and will be sent to elected officials in the next couple of weeks. Rick Ensdorff informed the group that the officials will have additionally available to them CDs, brochures, handouts, and the website.

Rick Ensdorff discussed the upcoming district outreach meetings schedule for the project. He stated that the next series of workshops would be in September and October for Classification Orientation and in March and April of 2007 for the Implementation Briefings.

Rick Ensdorff then asked for feedback on the value of this presentation to the attendees and asked for suggestions for the future ones. The only comment received was to have the meeting earlier in the day.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting ended at 4:15 p.m.